

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to entry of this Amendment, claims 1-52 and 56-67 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 5-7, 27, 36, 39, 43, 46, 50, 56, 59, 61, and 62 have been amended and claims 2-4, 28-30, 37, 38, 44, 45, 51, 52, 57, and 58 have been canceled herein. No claims have been added. Hence, after entry of this Amendment, claims 1, 5-27, 31-36, 39-43, 46-50, 56, and 59-67 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e), Gupta

The Office Action rejected claims 56, 59 and 60 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,226,752 B1 to Gupta et al., (hereinafter "Gupta"). The applicants traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons and respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims, as amended.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP 2131 citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Applicants respectfully argue that Gupta fails to disclose each and every claimed element. For example, claim 56, upon which claims 59 and 60 depend has been amended to recite in part "causing user session state information to be stored at a client for said first user wherein said user session state information is from a cookie stored on a client for said first user and said user session state information is encrypted." Additionally, claim 56 has been amended to recite in part "receiving a request from said application for unencrypted data from said user session state information; and providing said unencrypted data from said user session state information to said application, said application does not have access to a key to decrypt said unencrypted data from said user session state information."

As indicated in the Office Action, Gupta fails to disclose encrypting and decrypting user session information. Furthermore, since Gupta fails to disclose encrypting and decrypting user session information, Gupta cannot teach or suggest receiving a request from said application for unencrypted data from said user session state information; and providing said unencrypted data from said user session state information to said application, said application does not have access to a key to decrypt said unencrypted data from said user session state information.

It is noted that the Wood was used to show the limitations of claims 57 and 58 that are now included in amended claim 56. However, Wood fails to teach or suggest said application does not have access to a key to decrypt said unencrypted data from said user session state information. More specifically, Wood teaches in the portion cited (col. 7, lines 31-63) a public key encryption system where the authentication service uses its private key to encrypt contents of the session credentials. Each component of the system uses a public key corresponding to the authentication service's private key to decrypt the contents of the session credentials. That is, under Wood, each component, i.e., application, MUST have access to a key, i.e., the public key corresponding to the authentication service's private key, in order to decrypt the contents of the session credentials. Therefore, Wood cannot teach or suggest request from said application for unencrypted data from said user session state information; and providing said unencrypted data from said user session state information to said application, said application does not have access to a key to decrypt said unencrypted data from said user session state information. For at least these reasons, claims 56, 59 and 60 should be allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Gupta in view of Olden

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9-22, 26, 27, 31-36, 39-43, 46-50, 61 and 64-67 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,460,141 B1 to Olden, (hereinafter "Olden") 1, 2, 6, 7, 9-22, 26, 27, 31-36, 39-43, 46-50, 61 and 64-67 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of Olden. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of

obviousness in rejecting these claims. Therefore, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Office Action must establish: 1) some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or combine their teachings; 2) a reasonable expectation of success of such a modification or combination; and 3) a teaching or suggestion in the cited prior art of each claimed limitation. See MPEP §706.02(j). As will be discussed below, the references cited by the Office Action do not teach or suggest each claimed limitation. For example, the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest unencrypted data from encrypted session state information provided to an application where the application does not have access to a key to decrypt the session state information.

More specifically, claim 1, upon which claims 6, 7, 9-22, 26, and 64-67 depend, claim 36, upon which claims 39-42 depend, and claim 43, upon which claims 46-49 depend, each recite in part "receiving user session state information for a first user at an application program interface for an access system, said user session state information is from an application without a web agent front end, said user session state information is from a cookie stored on a client for said first user, said user session state information is encrypted, and said step of receiving user session state information includes decrypting said user session state information" and "receiving a request from said application for unencrypted data from said user session state information; and providing said unencrypted data from said user session state information to said application, said application does not have access to a key to decrypt said user session state information." Similarly, claim 27 upon which claims 31-35 depend, and claim 50 each recite in part "wherein said information from said cookie is encrypted" and "wherein said application does not have access to a key for decrypting said information from said cookie." Also, claim 61 recites in part "wherein said information from said cookie is encrypted and said application does not have access to a key for decrypting said information from said cookie."

However, none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest unencrypted data from encrypted session state information provided to an application where the application does not have access to a key to decrypt the session state information. It is noted that the Wood was used to show teaching of encrypted session information. However, Wood fails to teach or suggest said application does not have access to a key to decrypt said unencrypted data from said user session state information. Under Wood, each component, i.e., application, MUST have access to a key, i.e., the public key corresponding to the authentication service's private key, in order to decrypt the contents of the session credentials. Therefore, the combination of references cannot teach or suggest the limitations of the independent claims. For at least these reasons, claims 1, 6, 7, 9-22, 26, 27, 31-36, 39-43, 46-50, 61 and 64-67 should be allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Gupta in view of Olden and Wood

The Office Action rejected claims 3-5, 8, 28-30, 37, 38, 44, 45, 51, 52, 62 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of Olden as applied above and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,668,322 B1 to Wood et al., (hereinafter "Wood"). The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting these claims. Therefore, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

As noted above, none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest unencrypted data from encrypted session state information provided to an application where the application does not have access to a key to decrypt the session state information. It is noted that the Wood was used to show teaching of encrypted session information. However, Wood fails to teach or suggest said application does not have access to a key to decrypt said unencrypted data from said user session state information. Under Wood, each component, i.e., application, MUST have access to a key, i.e., the public key corresponding to the authentication service's private key, in order to decrypt the contents of the session credentials. Therefore, the combination of

references cannot teach or suggest the limitations of the independent claims. For at least these reasons, claims 5, 8, 62 and 63 should be allowed.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Gupta in view of Olden and Wenig

The Office Action rejected claims 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of Olden as applied above and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,286,098 B1 to Wenig et al., (hereinafter "Wenig"). The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting these claims. Therefore, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 1, upon which claims 23-25 depend, recites in part "receiving user session state information for a first user at an application program interface for an access system, said user session state information is from an application without a web agent front end, said user session state information is from a cookie stored on a client for said first user, said user session state information is encrypted, and said step of receiving user session state information includes decrypting said user session state information" and "receiving a request from said application for unencrypted data from said user session state information; and providing said unencrypted data from said user session state information to said application, said application does not have access to a key to decrypt said user session state information." None of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest unencrypted data from encrypted session state information provided to an application where the application does not have access to a key to decrypt the session state information. It is noted that the Wood was used to show teaching of encrypted session information. However, Wood fails to teach or suggest said application does not have access to a key to decrypt said unencrypted data from said user session state information. Under Wood, each component, i.e., application, MUST have access to a key, i.e., the public key corresponding to the authentication service's private key, in order to decrypt the contents of the session credentials. Therefore, the combination of references cannot teach or suggest the limitations of the independent claims. For at least these reasons, claims 23-25 should be allowed.

Appl. No. 09/814,091

PATENT

Amdt. dated: February 1, 2006

Reply to Office Action of November 1, 2005

35 U.S.C. § 103(a), Gupta in view of Wood


The Office Action rejected claims 57 and 58 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta in view of Wood. The Applicant respectfully points out that these claims have been canceled, thereby rendering the rejection moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



William J. Daley
Reg. No. 52,471

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 303-571-4321

CEK:sbm

60639778 v1